DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 310 JC 800 637

AUTHOR Clagett, Craig A.
TITLE Teacher Stress at a Community College: Professional Burnout in a Bureaucratic Setting.
INSTITUTION Prince George's Community Coll., Largo, Md. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty: Community Colleges: *Faculty College Relationship: Financial Problems: *Job Satisfaction: Literature Reviews: Organizational Climate: *Stress Variables: Teacher Administrator Relationship: *Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Workshops: *Teaching Conditions: Two Year Colleges: Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Burnout

ABSTRACT

A day-long faculty workshop was held at Prince George's Community College, a suburban Maryland institution, to identify the sources of stress affecting the faculty and to examine possible strategies for managing stress. At the workshop, the instructors were randomly assigned to small discussion groups and were asked, during the morning, to list the job situations found to be most stressful and, during the afternoon, to propose personal and organizational strategies for combatting stress. During the morning session, 218 stress generators were identified in six categories: administration (118), student-related (36), peer-related (23), financial (20), working conditions (16), and personal (5). The stress factors most frequently cited included lack of faculty participation in decision-making, the increase in under-prepared students coupled with student expectations of high grades, apathetic peers, and low salaries. The afternoon sessions yielded 153 strategies for reducing stress, including strict enforcement of prerequisite completion, realistic student placement, and the establishment of peer support networks. The study report reviews the literature dealing with "professional burnout" and presents a model for understanding stress, in which burnout is seen as a breakdown in the relationship between the individual and organization. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195310

TEACHER STRESS AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PROFESSIONAL BURNOUT IN A BUREAUCRATIC SETTING

Craig A. Clagett
Research Analyst
Prince George's Community College

JC 800 637

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

December 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Craig Clagett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHER STRESS AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE: PROFESSIONAL BURNOUT IN A BUREAUCRATIC SETTING

Introduction

Professional stress among teachers is a significant problem facing contemporary education. National surveys have reported percentages of teachers suffering from tension and anxiety ranging from 37 to 78 percent (Coates and Thoresen, 1976). Manifestations of stress may be physical, psychological, or behavioral. William White (1980) has grouped symptoms of professional stress under six headings (see Table 1). Prolonged contact with high stress work environments can affect an individual's health, behavior, emotional adjustment, relationships, attitudes, and values.

A distinctive kind of professional stress affecting "helping professionals" is "burnout." Maslach (1978) defines burnout as the emotional exhaustion resulting from the stress of interpersonal contact, which results in the professional losing respect or sympathy for clients, often evidenced by a cynical and dehumanizing perception of clients that labels them in derogatory ways. The syndrome is often associated with physical and emotional symptoms ranging from exhaustion and insomnia to migraines and ulcers. Deterioration of performance may also occur (Kahn, 1978). Marital and family conflicts frequently increase: "After an emotionally trying day spent with clients or patients, helping professionals want to get away from all people for a while -- and this desire for solitude usually comes at the expense of family and friends" (Maslach, p. 57).

While burnout originally was used to describe conditions affecting social workers and the like, increasing pressures on teachers have led to its application to an educational syndrome: faculty burnout. As demands for accountability mount, abilities of entering students decline, resources become scarce, and the future looks increasingly bleak, teachers have shown symptoms similar to other "burned-out" professionals. These symptoms impact on the school organization, and thus become a concern of school administrators. Organizational indicators of professional burnout include (1) high turnover, (2) low morale, (3) "we-they" polarizations, (4) increased concern with bureaucratic "turf," (5) conflicts over authority, (6) scapegoating of organizational leaders, (7) increased absenteeism, (8) and the replacement of informal communication by rigid, role-defined channels (White, 1980).

The goals of this paper were to identify sources of stress affecting faculty at a suburban community college in Maryland, estimate how widespread and intense the feelings of stress were among the faculty, examine possible strategies for reducing stress, and construct a simplified model for understanding this problem.

Prior Research

Numerous studies have investigated sources of teacher stress, primarily at the elementary and secondary school level. Most have relied on teacher responses to written questionnaires. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977, p. 305) have pointed out the shortcomings of such methods:

> Such methods fail to take into account the fact that different teachers may interpret the meaning of the questions differently, that their responses may be affected by ego-defensive processes, and that teachers may genuinely lack insight into their situation. Furthermore, stress is essentially multifactorial, and as such research must aim not simply to identify the sources of stress, but also to uncover

> the pattern of relationships between the sources of stress themselves, and to investigate the relationships between the sources of stress and those factors that determine whether they actually result in teacher stress in individual teachers.

Acknowledging these limitations, what sources of stress have been identified in prior research? A review of seven studies (Coates and Thoresen, 1976) found that the chief sources of anxiety among experienced teachers related to time demands, difficulties with pupils, large class enrollments, financial constraints, and lack of educational resources. Another published review of the literature (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1977) reported that clerical duties, negative student attitudes towards learning, inadequate teacher salaries, poor working conditions, and teaching pupils who have a wide range of abilities were common complaints among the teachers surveyed. Dealing with groups of wide ability was identified in several of the studies reviewed, while maintaining classroom discipline was rarely mentioned.

Another factor affecting teacher stress reported in the literature concerned the level of teacher participation in decision-making. Belasco and Alutto (1972) found that teachers who felt "decisionally deprived" reported significantly lower satisfaction levels and considerably more job tension. Some teachers were uncomfortable working on the educational assembly line, where they felt they had "no control over the products which came to them, nor over the design of the end product, nor even over the process by which they were expected to achieve that final result" (Selden, 1976, p. 32). These "disfranchised" teachers were in some cases alienated from the community itself. Partly as a result of the impacts of teacher strikes, but more a result of differences in lifestyles, conflict rather than cooperation has marked teacher-community relations, especially in large urban school systems.

Even in areas with little overt disagreement, teachers have been frustrated by the lack of parental and neighborhood support. Adams (1975) highlighted three conditions contributing to teacher frustration that have recently developed. The first concerned conflicting values. The civil rights movement, feminism, an unpopular war, a national political scandal -- these and other social events significantly changed the moral climate in which teachers practice, and also changed the personal values of many teachers. Where teachers' values differ from social norms, particularly those of the local community, administrators, students, or other teachers, tension results. A second recent source of frustration is the increased demands for public accountability. Teachers are being held responsible for producing specified results in student performance tests -- results that are influenced by factors beyond the teachers' control. Even in the area where they could have an impact -- the classroom -- teachers operate under constraints concerning course content, teaching methods, and student evaluation. The third source of frustration Adams called "the good shepherd ethic." This ethic requires teachers to insure that each student is successful in school, and is embodied in the concepts of student-centered teaching and individualized instruction. This ideal of providing the best education for each individual by meeting his or her unique needs is probably impossible in the context of today's mass education. Public education has had to subordinate diversity for efficiency, with standardized curricula, group-oriented instruction, and uniform rules and schedules. For some teachers, commitment to an ethic of individual development in a context of mass education can create a sense of inadequacy and dissatisfaction with themselves and the system of which they are a part.

A final source of teacher stress discussed in the literature centers on the conflict between professional autonomy and bureaucratic formalization. Beyond the sharing of finite resources and interdependent activity, organizational members may have fundamental disagreements arising from differences in goals. Teachers may regard themselves as professionals, but they most often work in bureaucracies. Hoy and Miskel (1978, p. 53) have summarized Weber's concept of bureaucracy as follows:

> Division of labor and specialization produce experts, and experts with an impersonal orientation make technically correct, rational decisions based on the facts. Once rational decisions have been made, the hierarchy of authority ensures disciplined compliance to directives and, alon, with rules and regulations, a well-coordinated system of implementation and uniformity and stability in the operation of the organization. Finally, a career orientation provides the incentive for employees to be loyal to the organization and to produce that extra effort. These characteristics function to maximize administrative efficiency because committed experts make rational decisions that are executed and coordinated in a disciplined way.

The characteristics of the Weberian model of bureaucracy can have dysfunctional, or negative, consequences. These can be exacerbated in organizations employing professionals. Miskel and Gerhardt (1974, p. 85) list four areas of possible conflict:

> First, the professional is bound by a norm of service while a bureaucrat's primary responsibility is to organization. Second, professional authority is based on technical knowledge while bureaucratic authority rests on a legal contract backed by formal sanctions. Third, professional decisions are based on internalized professional standards, while bureaucratic decisions represent compliance with directives from superiors. Finally, a professional's decision is judged by peers while a bureaucrat's decision is judged by a superior.

The degree of commitment to the organization and to the profession varies among individual teachers. Thornton (1971) argued that organizational commitment is more prevalent than professional commitment in elementary or secondary schools, while the reverse is true in colleges

and universities, where research reinforces the orientation towards academic disciplines. The community college teacher faces a more even balance in demands for organizational and professional commitment, and a dual orientation seems called for. White (1980) listed several other aspects of professional stress unique to community colleges. These included rapid institutional growth, changing student populations, and high percentages of part-time students and faculty.

Method

Since most of the research on teacher stress had focused on elementary or secondary schools, there appeared to be a need for investigation at the college level. Faculty at community colleges face conditions different from those at four-year institutions. While the "publish or perish" norm is less pervasive, community college teachers often are required to carry full teaching loads of 15 hours per semester. They must often deal with less prepared students. One of the major goals of this study was to identify the sources of stress affecting community college faculty.

Teacher stress surfaced as a significant problem at a suburban Maryland community college early in 1980. In response, a workshop on "Faculty Burnout" was incorporated in the fall orientation program. A local consulting firm led the workshop, which assigned faculty members on a random basis to small groups for discussion purposes. These small groups met twice. In the morning session, the groups were instructed to list the situations they found most stressful in the performance of their role within the college. These were written on a flip chart, for posting in the large meeting hall when the entire group met for a mid-day review of the results. A similar process was repeated in the

afternoon, at which time the groups were to discuss personal and organizational strategies to manage professional stress. Review of these responses made up the agenda for the final gathering of the entire group. The responses recorded on the flip charts during the individual group sessions constituted the data base for this paper. The responses were aggregated by response-category, and analyzed to determine how many of the 16 isolated groups mentioned the item, as well as the total number of times an item was listed.

Sources of Stress

The sixteen faculty groups generated a total of 218 responses when asked to identify sources of job stress. (A complete listing of responses is appended.) These were aggregated into six classifications, as follows:

Stress Classification	Responses
Administrative	118
Student-related	36
Peer-related	23
Financial	20
Working conditions	16
Personal	5

Thus over half of the sources of stress reported involved the college administration. Twenty responses, or nine percent of the total, concerned the lack of faculty influence over administrative decision-making. The administration's emphasis on student retention, interpreted by many faculty members as pressure to reduce academic standards, was the next most frequently mentioned source of stress. Other stress-generating items listed frequently included the number of required non-teaching duties, the administration's "paternalistic" attitude towards the faculty, the decline in student ability, and apathy among fellow faculty

members. (See Table 2 for a tabulation of faculty responses by classification.)

While the frequency count of responses suggested the intensity of feeling regarding the various sources of stress, a better measure of how widespread the perceptions were was the number of faculty groups mentioning each item. For purposes of analysis, only those stress-generators identified by at least six of the sixteen faculty groups are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Administrative Sources of Stress

Three-fourths of the faculty groups cited the lack of faculty participation or influence in decision-making as a major source of frustration. The perceived administration emphasis on quantity of students (credit hours=funding) over quality of academic work was mentioned by ten of the sixteen teacher groups. The number of non-teaching duties, lack of trust in the faculty, and the evaluation process were also mentioned by at least seven groups. Finally, unequal or large class sizes and inadequate release time (or sabbaticals) for updating course content produced stress among teachers in six groups.

Student-related Sources of Stress

The decline in student preparedness for college-level work was cited by members of ten faculty groups as a main source of stress. Associated with this was student expectations for high grades when their ability and effort do not warrant them. Lack of motivation among students was a source of frustration for six teacher groups.

Peer-related Sources of Stress

Apathy among fellow faculty members produced frustration for members of half the workshop groups. The lack of faculty interaction

through faculty socials, group projects, and similar activities with colleagues frustrated teachers in seven groups, who spoke of "isolation" resulting from uncooperative attitudes.

Financial Sources of Stress

Six groups reported anxiety resulting from salaries that have failed to keep up with inflation. Those at the top of the salary scale were frustrated by the pay ceilings.

Strategies for Reducing Stress

The afternoon sessions of the workshop were devoted to devising strategies for reducing faculty tension. Having identified sources of job stress, the teachers were asked to suggest ways of alleviating this problem. The sixteen faculty groups produced 153 suggested strategies (see Appendix). Some were vague, such as admonitions to "foster communication" or "think positively." Others were more specific, for example, "reinstitute sabbatical leave." (See Table 3 for a listing of strategies, complete with the number of groups suggesting each and the total number of mentions.)

Administrative/Organizational Strategies

The strategy suggested most often, accounting for 8 percent of the total, called for strict enforcement of prerequisites and realistic placement of students in courses for which they are properly prepared. Associated with this, six of the faculty groups urged college-wide agreement on the promotion of academic excellence and the maintaining of high standards. Seven groups thought the college should agree on and publicize the responsibilities the student must assume for successful learning to take place. The other organizational strategies with

broad support concerned faculty-administration communication. Seven of the faculty groups suggested that the administration should share fiscal and managerial decision-making with the faculty.

Personal Strategies

The most common personal strategy suggested was to develop outside interests. Establishing support networks, such as faculty clubs or social events, was another frequent suggestion.

Recommendations and Conclusions

It is tempting to attribute "burnout" to personal inabilities or weaknesses on the part of those who succumb. However, it is a conclusion of this paper that stress will be better understood when it is seen as an organizational outcome, rather than symptomatic of defects in the personalities of its casualties. Maslach (1978, p. 58) pointed to environmental or situational causes of job stress:

> Although this dispositional analysis attributing the fault to "bad" persons is fairly widely held, a contrary theme emerging from our research is that the source of the problem lies more in the situation than in the people and that the problem is best understood and modified in terms of the social and situational sources of the job-related stresses. Burnout's prevalence, and the range of seemingly disparate professionals who are affected by it, suggest that we should be looking at the "bad" situations in which many good people function rather than trying to uncover the "bad" people who are staffing institutions.

To the extent that this analysis is true, organizational responses become significant. White (1980) has classified organizational responses to professional burnout into four approaches:

(1) *The Authoritarian-Moral Approach:* Burnout is seen as symptomatic of character defects. The individual is impugned with malicious motives toward the organization. The organization responds by punishing those who seemingly don't want to work by sanctions or even

termination. This approach is an oversimplification which ignores situational factors, precludes communication, is unsupported by research, and contributes nothing towards solving the underlying problems.

(2) *The Clinical Approach:* Burnout behavior is seen as a reflection of individual psychopathology. After a clinical diagnosis, therapy is prescribed or the employee is released. Like the Authoritarian-Moral Approach, this approach individualizes what is essentially an interactional problem and fails to address the need to modify the work environment. It can also stigmatize the individual, increasing the feelings of isolation and escalating the burnout process.

(3) *The Training Approach:* Burnout is viewed as a result of skill deficiencies. The organization responds with employee training programs in stress management and time utilization. Training in the workers' job field may also be included. This approach ignores the necessity of modifying the high stress work environment.

(4) *The Systems Approach:* From a systems perspective, burnout is seen as a breakdown in the relationship between the individual and the organization. The individual dysfunction is symptomatic of system dysfunction. The systems response includes modification of both the work situation and the individual's coping methods. Typical objectives are to reduce the sources of stress while simultaneously increasing support structures.

A Model for Understanding Stress

The Systems Approach seems the most promising. This is because stress can best be understood as the product of the interactions of three elements:

(1) The *environment or organizational context.* How the individual reacts to specific stress situations is influenced by the

organizational climate, interpersonal relationships, operating procedures, and other conditions which describe the setting in which the individual works. Changes in the environment, such as changing student populations, enrollment declines, and budgetary restrictions, are not only sources of stress by themselves but alter the context in which other potential stress generators are received.

(2) The *specific stress generators*. Whether an individual will feel stress, and its magnitude and manifestations, depends on the nature of the particular event or agent involved.

(3) The *individual vulnerability* to stress. People differ in their reactions to the same stressful situations. Differences in coping abilities are due in part to differences in health histories, values and beliefs, social and family supports, professional training, work histories, and stage of life.

Concluding Remarks

A review of the literature and an analysis of perceptions of community college faculty led to a conclusion that (1) there are numerous sources of teacher stress, (2) that the severity and behavioral results of stress vary according to the context, individual vulnerability, and nature of the stress generator, and (3) that the most promising strategy for reducing stress will be a systems approach designed to modify the work environment, eliminate or lessen specific sources of stress, and support individual efforts to manage personal stress.

While more extensive analysis would be needed to prescribe specific actions at the community college studied, some general strategies can be suggested. First, the administration must acknowledge that a problem exists. Second, the faculty must acknowledge that some stress

is unavoidable. The changing mission of the community college, the changing student population being served, the tightening economic situation -- these are factors the institution will have to face during the coming years. What might the college do? Ways could be found to increase faculty participation in making decisions which directly affect them. In cases where the administration feels no compromise is feasible, more effort could be made to explain their decisions and the reasons behind them. Several faculty comments suggested that decisions were interpreted as "arbitrary' and "paternalistic" primarily because they were received as orders from authority, with little or no justification -- justification the faculty, as professionals, expect and deserve. A second recommendation concerns counseling and placement of students in courses. Students who need developmental courses could be required to complete them before admission to credit courses. Alternatively, strict enforcement of prerequisites for more advanced classes could be the rule, perhaps using computerized screening at registration. A final suggestion would be the establishment of additional support mechanisms for faculty members. These could include periodic social events, team-teaching across disciplines, a faculty club, additional release time for updating and designing courses, and other methods to maintain faculty interest and creativity.

Table 1

PERSONAL INDICATORS OF PROFESSIONAL STRESS

Health Indicators	Excessive Behavior Indicators	Emotional Adjustment Indicators	Relationship Indicators	Attitude Indicators
Fatigue and chronic exhaustion	Increased consumption of: caffeine, tobacco, alcohol, over-the-counter medications, psychoactive prescription drugs, illicit drugs	Emotional distancing	Isolation from or over-bonding with other staff	Grandiosity
Frequent and prolonged colds	High risk taking behavior--auto/cycle accidents, falls, "high risk" hobbies, general proneness to accidents and injuries, gambling, extreme mood and behavioral changes	Paranoia	Responding to students in mechanical manner	Boredom
Headaches	Increased propensity for violent and aggressive behavior	Depression--loss of meaning, loss of hope	Increased isolation from students	Cynacism
Sleep disturbances--insomnia, nightmares, excessive sleeping	Over and under eating	Decreased emotional control	Increased anger at students	Sick humor--aimed particularly at students
Ulcers	Hyperactivity	Martyrdom	Increased interpersonal conflicts with other staff	Air of righteousness
Gastro-intestinal disorders		Fear of "going crazy"	Increased problems in marital and other interpersonal relationships away from work, including relationships with one's children	Hyper-critical of institution and/or peers
Sudden losses or gains in weight		Increased amount of time daydreaming/fantasy	Social isolation--overinvolvement with students--using students to meet personal and social needs	Expressions of hopelessness and frustration
Flare-ups of pre-existing medical disorders, e.g., diabetes high blood pressure, asthma.		Constant feelings of being "trapped"		**Value Indicators**
Injuries from high risk behavior		Nervous ticks		Sudden and often dramatic changes in one's values and beliefs
Muscular pain particularly in lower back & neck		Undefined fears		
Increased premenstrual tension		Inability to concentrate		
Missed menstrual cycles		Intellectualization		

© 1979, William L. White

Table 2

SOURCES OF FACULTY STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Administrative		
Lack of faculty influence in decision-making	12	20
Emphasis on retention, pressures to reduce standards, quantity versus quality	10	17
Too many non-teaching duties, committees, required meetings	8	13
Paternalistic attitude towards faculty, lack of trust in faculty	7	10
Evaluation process time-consuming, lacks credibility	7	9
Unequal class sizes, classes too large	6	7
No release time to update programs, no sabbaticals	6	6
Too many rules and regulations	5	8
Arbitrary decisions, favoritism	4	4
No opportunities for professional growth	4	4
Lack of faculty assistants, support services	3	3
Too many part-time faculty relative to full-time	3	3
Inadequate enforcement of pre-requisites, improper placement	2	3
No recognition of faculty achievements	2	2
Administration does not back up faculty in disputes with students	2	2
Uncertainty of schedules	2	2
Too many administrators	2	2

Table 2 (Cont.)

SOURCES OF FACULTY STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Administrative (Continued)		
Associate Dean's role ambiguity	2	2
Predictions of 'doom and gloom'	1	1
Student-related		
Decline in ability	10	11
Student hostility, complaints	7	9
Lack of motivation, interest	6	9
Wide range of ability in same class	5	5
Changing student population	2	2
Peer-related		
Faculty apathy	8	11
No faculty-faculty interaction	7	7
Inconsistent grading standards among faculty	2	2
Lack of strong Faculty Sentate	2	2
Part-time faculty misperceptions	1	1
Financial		
Inadequate salaries, inflation, ceilings	6	7
No security, terminal contracts	5	6
No rewards for hard work, excellence	4	4
Restrictions on outside employment	2	3

Table 2 (Cont.)

SOURCES OF FACULTY STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Working Conditions		
Improper room temperature	4	5
Inadequate office space	3	4
Personal safety, theft (evenings)	2	2
Parking inconvenient	2	2
Distance between classes	2	2
Smoking in buildings	1	1
Personal		
Bored doing same thing over and over	3	3
Covering material in 16 weeks	1	1
No time for family, outside interests	1	1

Table 3

STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Administrative/Organizational		
Enforce prerequisites, realistic placement	9	12
Foster faculty-administration communication	9	9
Agree on and publicize student responsibilities	7	9
Share all fiscal/managerial decision-making with faculty	7	9
Promote high standards, academic excellence	6	9
Recognize and reward faculty excellence	5	6
Support faculty in conflicts with students and outside agencies	5	5
Role exchange programs (other institutions?)	4	6
Reduce and simplify evaluations	4	5
Maintain physical plant, security	4	5
Eliminate required meetings during Orientation	4	4
Establish faculty-administration committee to implement workshop findings	4	4
Increase resources for conferences, professional development	3	4
Reinstitute sabbatical leave	3	3
Provide time/support for curriculum development	3	3
Have realistic cost-of-living increases	3	3
Allow small sections of advanced courses	2	2

Table 3 (Cont.)

STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Administrative/Organizational (Cont.)		
Create a grant development office	2	2
Transfer administrative jobs to faculty	1	3
Increase student-faculty interaction	1	2
Involve faculty in high school articulation	1	1
Establish a foundation to encourage donations	1	1
Switch to a quarter system	1	1
Enforce the student code of conduct	1	1
Extend time final exams -- date grades due	1	1
Pair part-time teachers with full-time faculty	1	1
Permit employment outside college	1	1
Balance class sizes	1	1
Provide pay incentives for further education	1	1
Provide early retirement incentives	1	1
Personal Strategies		
Develop outside interests	6	8
Think positively	4	6
Set up faculty support groups	4	4
Attend, speak up at Board meetings	3	4
Teach at students' level	3	3
Learn stress/time management skills	3	3

Table 3 (Cont.)

STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING STRESS

	Number of Faculty Groups Mentioning Item	Total Number of Mentions
Personal Strategies (Cont.)		
Vacation away from the area	2	3
Support union	2	2
Use a variety of instructional methods	2	2
Physical exercise	2	2
Teach new courses -- even outside department	1	1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, David W. "Tired and Frustrated Teachers," *Today's Education*, Vol. 64, No. 1 (1975), 37-41.

Allutto, Joseph A., and James A. Balasco. "Patterns of Teacher Participation in School System Decision Making," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1973), 27-41.

Belasco, James A., and Joseph A. Allutto. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1972), 44-58.

Coates, Thomas J., and Carl E. Thoresen. "Teacher Anxiety: A Review with Recommendations," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1976), 159-179.

Forsyth, Patrick B., and Wayne K. Hoy. "Isolation and Alienation in Educational Organizations," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1978), 80-96.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Random House, 1978.

Kahn, Robert. "Job Burnout: Prevention and Remedies," *Public Welfare*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1978), 61-63.

Kuhlman, Edward, and Wayne K. Hoy. "The Socialization of Professionals into Bureaucracies: The Beginning Teacher in the School," *The Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (1974), 18-27.

Kyriacou, Chris, and John Sutcliffe. "Teacher Stress: A Review," *Educational Review*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (1977), 299-306.

Maslach, Christina. "Job Burnout: How People Cope," *Public Welfare*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1978), 56-58.

Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50 (1943), 370-396.

Miskel, Cecil, and Ed Gerhardt. "Perceived Bureaucracy, Teacher Conflict, Central Life Interests, Voluntarism, and Job Satisfaction," *The Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1974), 84-97.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 6 (1962), 463-482.

Selden, David. "Teachers and Community: Partners or Enemies," *Journal of Education*, Vol. 158, No. 3 (1976), 31-47.

Sergiovanni, Thomas, and Fred Carver. *The New School Executive.* New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Stephens, Thomas. "Innovative Teaching Practices: Their Relation to System Norms and Rewards," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 10 (1974), 35-43.

Thornton, Russell. "Organizational-Professional Commitment and Supervision of the Junior College Teacher," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 7 (1971), 25-39.

White, William L. *Managing Personal and Organizational Stress in Institutions of Higher Education.* Rockville, Maryland: H.C.S., Inc., 1980.

APPENDICES

I. Stress Generators

II. Stress Reduction Strategies

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group A

1. Conflict between student abilities and the administration's emphasis on student retention.

2. Increased responsibilities of full-time faculty caused by the necessity of performing extracurricular duties that part-time faculty are not available to do.

3. Part-time faculty misperceptions of student abilities and needs, as well as resources and support systems.

4. Tension between consumer-oriented education and academic learning.

5. The evaluation process is too time consuming and counter-productive.

6. Overemphasis on written documentation to preclude court actions -- the College operates according to lawyer-generated policies.

7. Communication conflict between faculty members' perception of being professionals and administration's apparent perception of faculty as workers.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group B

1. Conflict between the requirements of the College and outside agencies.

2. Lack of faculty input and consultation in decisions affecting the faculty.

3. Student resistance and hostility generated by conflict over scope and standards required by faculty.

4. Pressure upon faculty for student retention to satisfy F.T.E. requirement.

5. Lack of understanding and support in faculty-student conflicts.

6. Necessity to respond to such a wide variety of students.

7. Little administrative recognition of professional faculty achievements inside and outside the College.

8. Paternalistic attitude on the part of the administration toward the faculty.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group C

1. Lack of communication between faculty and administration.

2. "Paternalistic, authoritarian, moral" attitude of the administration.

3. No way to communicate easily to administration.

4. Lack of motivation and ability of students.

5. Pressure from the administration to lower standards.

6. Difficulty in preserving the standards in class; allowing students to repeat a given course over and over.

7. Administrative concern with quantity (credit hours, number of students) not quality of education.

8. No possibility for gathering and exchanging new ideas.

9. No possibility for personal and professional growth and enrichment.

10. Lack of sabbatical leave.

11. Diminished enthusiasm over a period of time.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group D

1. Inability to affect working conditions.

2. Cumulative fatigue, getting worse as semester goes on.

3. Building resentment over non-teaching duties, such as committee assignments, evaluation plan -- particularly when you suspect they are non-productive.

4. Difficulties in establishing lasting student-teacher relationships.

5. Unpredictability of classroom temperature; equipment malfunctions.

6. Lack of shared governance.

7. Lack of financial security -- loss of real income due to inflation.

8. Student attitude of buying credits with least cost in time and effort.

9. Pressure to retain students.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group E

1. Delegating tasks -- lack of cooperation.
2. Isolation from other organizational members.
3. Terminal employment contracts.
4. Locked into salary scale -- no rewards for excellence.
5. Covering all the material in 16 weeks.
6. Keeping up standards.
7. Unprepared students who have very high grade expectations.
8. Unbalanced enrollment between sections due to self-advisement and impersonal registration.
9. Lack of acceptance of faculty input in administrative decisions affecting faculty.
10. Completion of faculty evaluation packet.
11. Student evaluations.
12. Transportation and parking.
13. Meeting time demands of work, family, and outside activities.
14. Lack of time to update programs to meet changing requirements.
15. Changing student population.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group F

1. Orientation Week -- too much time spent in required, structured activities.

2. Finals week.

3. Paper grading and class load.

4. Lack of organization's trust in faculty's professional integrity -- for example, head-count during orientation week, lack of adequate time for independent preparation.

5. Lack of respect for total professional role of faculty including the need for professional growth through conferences, research, and independent study.

6. Administration attitude -- you are not working unless you are in your office or classroom between 9 - 5.

7. Isolation of one department from another prevents peer understanding and support.

8. Lack of adequate release time for curriculum revision.

9. Apparent favoritism shown in assignment of release time, staff development, and executive leave.

10. No encouragement or support for faculty to engage in professional growth outside the institution, such as losing benefits for taking executive leave.

11. Lack of faculty input in determination of who gets staff development leave and release time.

12. Students inadequately prepared for college work.

13. Student/teacher ratio in clinical work too high.

14. Too many meetings -- repetition of content.

15. Administrative pressures keep us from our primary mission of teaching.

16. Lack of administrator's understanding of unique problems and demands within individual disciplines.

17. Associate Dean's role is administrative -- he/she is not viewed as master teacher within discipline (role ambiguity of associate deans produces faculty stress).

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group G

1. Decisions are not made at department levels where the knowledge is, for example RIF policies, scheduling, rules, evaluation. Too many decisions from above.
2. Student complaints about grades -- they assume we "owe" them a grade.
3. Bored with job -- doing the same thing over and over.
4. Inadequate facilities (physical education, limited and overcrowded offices, science rooms, parking, etc.).
5. Air conditioning too hot or too cold.
6. Decline in student preparation.
7. Decline in students (enrollment).
8. Lateness of students (late to class and late at beginning of semester).
9. Feeling of lack of control over registrations procedure.
10. Administration "blames" faculty for high student failure rate.
11. Uneven work levels -- some teach 125 students, others 40 (within departments).
12. Evaluation -- deadlines, frequency, paperwork, validity.
13. Tentativeness of schedules -- creates uncertainty.
14. Overload policy -- (1) certain faculty required to do an overload, others aren't, (2) overload restriction, (3) Employment Form -- shouldn't have it, restricts freedom, none of their business.
15. Faculty has no clout in many areas, for example required attendance at orientation for an entire week, training programs after finals.
16. Faculty apathy -- won't act, have given up, don't rock the boat, impotence.
17. Too many administrators -- too many rules.
18. Lack of support services (physical plant, media equipment).
19. Student evaluations.

Faculty Group G (Cont.)

20. Health -- smoke in buildings.
21. Arbitrary decisions (leave, AIP's, release time).
22. People bitch about small things -- unimportant.
23. Lack of rewards for hard work.
24. Lack of communication -- faculty don't know each other.
25. Inflexible procedures.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group H

1. Insufficient "stress" -- excessive conflict avoidance.

2. Negative rewards for creativity.

3. Changes in values of organization over time.

4. Role ambiguity of associate deans.

5. Inability to achieve desired changes in other areas -- inability to penetrate internal boundaries ("turf").

6. Conflicting priorities within administrative structure.

7. Conflicting "political" philosophies of faculty, administration, students.

8. Issues versus ego--tends to confuse decision-making process (turf).

9. Stability vs. openness to change.

10. C.Y.A. skills deficiency.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group I

1. Students lack motivation -- escessive absenteeism.

2. Guilt feelings from compromising academic standards.

3. Lack of policy on faculty work amount.

4. Developing new programs without release time.

5. Teaching schedules -- lack of faculty input.

6. Lack of standardized procedures.

7. Paternalistic feeling from Administration and Board of Trustees.

8. Responsibility versus Authority.

9. Ceilings on salary, lack of reward for professionalism.

10. Evaluation -- frequency, length -- too cumbersome.

11. Financial interests vs. student ability -- number of students determines a class rather than interest/ability of students and faculty.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group J

1. No lateral or upward mobility within the profession.

2. Change in the ethnic composition of the student body.

3. Mixed abilities of class.

4. Repetitiveness of class content and teacher role.

5. Overly structured sabbatical procedure.

6. Role overload -- overly long workshop sessions.

7. High ratio of part-time to full-time faculty.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group K

1. Lack of intellectual outlets.

2. Terminal position status.

3. Tenure problems.

4. Favoritism to "pet" departments.

5. Lack of a real College Senate group as in pre-1974.

6. Lack of faculty dining room.

7. Administration has "divided and conquered" the faculty.

8. Obsolete salary scale -- lack of compensation at top of scale. Salary increases not in line with inflation.

9. Lack of adequate explanation for decisions made by deans.

10. Lowering of faculty grading standards.

11. Merchandising for enrollment demeaning to professional faculty.

12. Too much evaluation for new faculty; too little for old faculty.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group L

1. Negative attitude of some faculty members.
2. Inconsistent standards in the classroom among faculty.
3. Sharing office space with people who have incompatible habits (smoking, neatness).
4. Required to teach same course over and over -- failure of some faculty to teach different courses.
5. Week-long orientation.
6. Temperature variations -- problems with heat and air conditioning.
7. Failure of salaries to keep up with inflation.
8. No reward for good teaching.
9. Lack of adequate faculty office space.
10. Faculty evaluation plan lacks creditibility among faculty and is too time-consuming.
11. Decision-making without consulting those affected.
12. Security -- personal safety and theft.
13. Class size too large.
14. Timing of decisions -- long lead time required in faculty course scheduling/last minute administrative decisions (such as office changes).
15. Lack of response to faculty proposals.
16. Low part-time faculty salaries.
17. Too many administrators and non-teaching personnel.
18. Decline in the ability of many students.
19. Wide range of ability within the same class.
20. Unrealistic expectations of students on amount of time and work required, course outcome, instructor's role, and own ability.
21. Conflict between school work and outside obligations and interests -- student's schedule only allows for class time.
22. Student ignorance of college-wide procedures (withdrawal, attending class).

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group M

1. Increase in we/they attitudes between faculty and administration.
2. Lost communication due to "classic" role playing.
3. Being bought off by being told "it could be worse."
4. Predictions of doom and gloom.
5. Concerns due to RIF policy -- positions jeopardized by factors beyond your control.
6. Faculty afraid to take professional risks.
7. Lack of control over scheduling, courses, etc.
8. Inconsistent standards for multi-section courses.
9. Differences between day and evening students.
10. Young students discourteous in class.
11. Community college students do not cope well with large class settings (large lecture halls).
12. Giving too much in classroom and getting nothing back from students.
13. Students disinterested, do not participate.
14. Competition for offices and equipment.
15. Long distance between classes.
16. Inadequate checking of prerequisites/improper placement of students with a great need for developmental work.
17. Lack of funding and space for faculty assistants.
18. Conflicts with students concerning faculty expectations.
19. Faculty lacks techniques to cope with student inadequacies.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group N

1. Remaining impartial towards students/dealing with disparate personality types among students in same class.

2. Dealing with dishonest students.

3. Controlling classroom situations.

4. Lack of security in the evenings.

5. Co-curricular overload.

6. Too many demands on individuals with a limited amount of time.

7. Dealing with students with barriers to learning (foreign students, handicapped, learning anxiety).

8. Deficiencies in physical plant (heating, lighting, noise).

9. Inconvenient scheduling of classrooms.

10. Lack of professional challenges when a career plateau is reached.

11. Coping with repetition in subject matter.

12. Interpersonal relationships with administrators.

13. Large class size.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group O

1. Instead of dealing with problems on an individual basis, rules and regulations are passed applying to everyone -- the whole group suffers because of a few.

2. No "positive strokes" from administration for work done at or outside the institution.

3. Too much time spent on administrative tasks.

4. Allied Health -- responsibility for student behavior at agencies.

5. Too much power in the hands of too few people -- should be greater dispersion of power.

6. In the Technical area, days are too long when have clinical as well as on-campus demands (such as meetings).

7. Salaries at upper levels are not keeping up with inflation.

8. Increasing reliance on part-time instructors causes increased workload for full-time instructors.

9. Lack of autonomy at division or department level.

10. Being asked to do more with less: teach more students, develop more innovative approaches -- with fewer resources.

11. Dealing with students who possess less ability -- particularly the last two years.

12. Poor language of some administrators.

13. Creation of Mickey Mouse rules and regulations which lowers morale and job dignity.

14. Faculty lacks any meaningful power -- very difficult to get any change.

STRESS GENERATORS

Faculty Group P

1. Doubt as to the extent of faculty authority in handling the removal of unruly students from the classroom (Will I be backed up?).
2. Sense of not really belonging owing to status as part-timer.
3. Drive for retention versus drive for excellence.
4. Uncertainty of part-time faculty as to whether job will be available next term.
5. Structured orientation programs consume time that could be spent getting ready for students.
6. The orientation exercise is mere theory and busy work having no probable follow-up.
7. Transportation problems.
8. Constraints and rules increasing numerically.
9. Increasing involvement in interruptive, non-teaching responsibilities.
10. Stress from organizational policies with little ability to change those policies.
11. Decreased student abilities and preparedness.
12. Use of, and processing, student evaluations.
13. Economic pressures -- generation of credit hours and retention emphasized.
14. Ineffective enforcement of prerequisites.
15. Poor advice from counselors.
16. Unclear role of community college -- is our role remedial?
17. Conflict between student expectations and faculty expectations.
18. Negativism on part of faculty.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group A

1. Clarification of frequency of evaluations of administrators at all levels.

2. "Twinning" part-timers with full-time faculty in an effort at bonding.

3. Priority be given to maintaining heating and cooling systems in all buildings.

4. Foster two-way communication.

5. More stroking for all personnel, i.e., public and private acknowledgement and recognition for years of service, effective teaching, and contributions to the college community.

6. More attention be given to realistic individual counseling. Retention goals should be stated in terms of students' needs rather than institutional needs. (Full time employed students should take fewer credits.)

7. Begin teaching at the students' level.

8. Do not make the college your life. Plan or build in fun activities and outside involvements to reduce stress.

9. Set up a network of support groups.

10. "Incestuous" relationships are unprofessional and should be avoided.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group B

1. Form a joint faculty-administration committee to address the issues emerging from the Burnout Workshop report.

2. A College-wide statement of student responsibilities should be disseminated in an effective and public manner.

3. Place emphasis on quality rather than quantity.

4. Active enforcement of the student code of conduct, and a committee of faculty and administrators to consider this growing problem.

5. Recognition of the conflicting requirements between the College ar outside agencies, and administrative support of faculty.

6. Enforce placement and prerequisite requirements.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group C

1. Support from upper administration on curriculum study and planning.

2. Long range trend analysis and institutional commitment to the Liberal Arts tradition and other goals of higher education.

3. Monetary and non-monetary rewards for success.

4. Workshops on administrative/managerial techniques, conducted in a candid and open manner.

5. Avoid win-lose confrontations.

6. Investigate faculty-administrative exchange programs.

7. Investigate early retirement plans and incentives.

8. Have informal small group workshop sessions.

9. Have specific rewards for achievement.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group D

1. Sharing with faculty all aspects of fiscal-managerial policies and procedures.

2. Cost of living increase no less than that of other county employees.

3. Personal resolve to leave work problems at work.

4. Learn better time management skills.

5. Become involved in different activities.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group E

1. Consider tri-mester or quarter system to promote greater flexibility in faculty work schedules.
2. Merit pay system.
3. Change frequency of evaluation.
4. Students must complete developmental courses as prerequisite to higher skill level courses.
5. Mandatory advisement.
6. Attract better students from high schools.
7. Faculty involvement in high school articulation.
8. A faculty member should be a member of the Board of Trustees.
9. An administrator should be a member of the Board of Trustees.
10. Vacation away from the area.
11. Take a dance class, run, bicycle long distances.
12. Visit Berkley Springs, West Va. and get massaged.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group F

1. Re-institute sabbatical leave.

2. More conference travel money.

3. Administrative support and understanding of faculty need for conference attendance -- administrative encouragement of professional growth.

4. Associate Deans should be sensitive to the people whom they service, i.e., the faculty.

5. A better balance between standards (quality of instruction) and the need for students.

6. Transfer courses must be kept at high standards so students can compete at universities and to maintain the integrity of PGCC.

7. Faculty should be supported in maintaining high standards.

8. Meeting times during orientation should be minimized so that the rest of the time can be devoted to course preparation.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group G

1. Understand existing conditions.

2. Get together with other faculty -- dinner lounges, retreats.

3. Think positively.

4. Speak up at Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees meetings.

5. Students should be informed that the first week of class is essential.

6. Write out and explain class regulations and requirements, refer to them throughout semester.

7. Use a variety of instructional methods.

8. Telephone students.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group H

1. Provide role changes to stimulate creativity.

2. Support individual professional development.

3. Small group role playing, and new groups, to break down turf and ego barriers to needed communication.

4. Establish a process for developing rather than imposing priorities and tasks.

5. Commitment to act on above strategies.

6. Commitment to participatory long-range planning as a solution to role ambiguity.

7. Search for something interesting at work and in your profession.

8. If you cannot do #7, find something interesting in your personal life.

9. Don't fight the problem: solve it!

10. Don't raise the bridge: lower the river!

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group I

1. Allow faculty more flexibility in selection of teaching schedules.

2. Allow travel to conferences and seminars related to teaching duties.

3. Opportunities to teach low enrollment, special interest classes (in view of overall student load).

4. Let "some good" come out of these sessions.

5. Return to sabbaticals.

6. Create a grant development area.

7. More fully activate the intern program.

8. Change the student evaluation forms.

9. Provide release time for projects beyond the teaching workload.

10. Establish a Foundation to encourage monetary contributions.

11. Stress Management Training sessions.

12. Give more time during orientation to do individual work.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group J

1. Increase administration-faculty communication.
2. Require developmental students to finish these courses before enrolling in credit courses.
3. Establish a tracking system based on ability level.
4. Commit faculty to consensus on student responsibilities.
5. Provide time from job responsibilities for professional growth.
6. Administrative support of faculty in classroom policies and procedures.
7. Pay incentives for further education.
8. Extend deadline between final exam and date grades must be recorded.
9. More directed counseling.
10. Reward faculty for time spent on support activities.
11. Allow unique plans to solve problems within departments.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group K

1. Establish and enforce more stringent entrance requirements for those courses where it is appropriate.

2. Recommend to students at registration that they allow time in their schedules for faculty consultation.

3. Accept the recommended Honors Program.

4. Learn to say "no" to unreasonable student demands for grades and time -- also to say "no" to administrative pressures regarding same.

5. Do a good job and get away.

6. Develop a good balance between personal and professional lives.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group L

1. Limit the amount of required large group activities during Orientation Week, to allow more time for individual, departmental, and divisional planning.

2. Invite the Director of Physical Plant to divisional meetings to discuss heat, air conditioning, lights, leaks, etc.

3. Renew efforts for (the right to) collective bargaining.

4. Across-the-board step every two years for those at the top of the salary scale.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group M

1. Faculty exchange program with other institutions.

2. Administrative exchange with other institutions.

3. Faculty-initiated proposals for administrative internships.

4. Alternative routes to decision-makers.

5. Strong ethical support from administration.

6. Computerize prerequisite information for enforcement at registration.

7. Clearer explanations for decisions from administrators.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group N

1. Use Orientation Week for course preparation -- have fewer meetings.
2. Transfer administrative jobs to faculty.
3. Counselors should be faculty.
4. Let smaller enrollment sections make to stimulate faculty -- more flexibility on course cancellation.
5. Sabbaticals.
6. Support College seeking funds for additional facilities.
7. Chair rails to prevent damage.
8. Balance class size (via computer?)
9. Better training for computer operators used during registration.
10. Enforce prerequisites.
11. Simplify, improve evaluation -- do it less often.
12. Get rid of student evaluations.
13. Abolish limits on overload policy.
14. Abolish employment form -- employment outside institution should be allowed.
15. A faculty member should be on the Board of Trustees.
16. Faculty should be told who makes decisions and why.
17. Review and eliminate administrators.
18. Physical plant should be more responsive to communications from faculty.
19. Have a faculty committee for granting leave.
20. Have more faculty social functions -- faculty club.
21. Support union.
22. Teach at different times to break routine.

Faculty Group N (Continued)

23. Establish a late policy for students.

24. Improve faculty-administration communications at same level (faculty feels dominated) -- perhaps an ombudsperson.

25. Teach different subjects -- even out of your major area.

26. Change teaching methods to adapt to students.

27. Use a specific syllabus with trial examinations.

28. Leave! (Or get a second job for inspiration.)

29. Look at other institutions.

30. Dress appropriately -- adapt to conditions.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group O

1. Make clear to students in handbook and orientation what to expect in a college classroom and what their role is in the student-instructor relationship.

2. Students who do not score sufficiently high on the CGP should not be admitted to credit courses.

3. Give departments and Associate Deans more autonomy to make decisions which affect their area (class size, budget allocation).

4. Hire work-study students to perform routine security duties so that security officers can spend more time making us secure.

5. College should spend a small portion of its budget to hire some qualified, quality student helpers in those areas where they are needed.

6. Make co-curricular activities more rewarding personally and financially (allow instructor to substitute regular course for co-curricular activity or take overload pay).

7. Administrators need to deal with individuals on an individual basis -- do not make rules for entire faculty.

STRESS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Faculty Group P

1. Establish basic skills requirements for every credit course, and enforce.

2. Have Faculty Senate committees communicate with administration.

3. Understand that students must share responsibility for successful learning experience.

4. Persist in maintaining standards.

5. Stop taking responsibility for things you cannot control.

6. Learn stress management techniques.

7. Hot tub!

8. Develop hobbies.

JAN 09 1980

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024